



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/828,395	04/19/2004	John K. Jackson	UBC.P-032	5836
21121	7590	10/17/2005	EXAMINER	
OPPEDAHL AND LARSON LLP P O BOX 5068 DILLON, CO 80435-5068			VIVLEMORE, TRACY ANN	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1635	
DATE MAILED: 10/17/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/828,395	JACKSON ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Tracy Vivlemore	1635	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 1 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 1-10 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                  | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)            |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____  |

*js*

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Election/Restrictions*

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 2, 3, 7 and 8, drawn to a method of treating a non-cancerous angiogenesis related disease or reducing angiogenesis in a non-cancerous angiogenesis related disease using a therapeutic composition that is an antisense oligonucleotide, classified in class 514, subclass 44. Election of this invention requires a further election of a single nucleotide sequence as set forth below.
- II. Claims 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 and 10, drawn to a method of treating a non-cancerous angiogenesis related disease or reducing angiogenesis in a non-cancerous angiogenesis related disease using a therapeutic composition that is an RNAi agent, classified in class 514, subclass 44. Election of this invention requires a further election of a single nucleotide sequence as set forth below.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

1. Inventions I and II are unrelated. Inventions are unrelated if it can be shown that they are not disclosed as capable of use together and they have different modes of operation, different functions, or different effects (MPEP § 806.04, MPEP § 808.01). In the instant case the different inventions have different modes of operation. Invention I is a method of treating a disease using an antisense oligonucleotide, which is a single

Art Unit: 1635

stranded DNA or RNA that operates by activating RNase H. Invention II is a method of treating a disease using an RNAi agent which is a double stranded RNA that operates by activating the RISC complex.

2. Furthermore, examining invention I together with invention II would impose a serious search burden. In the instant case, prior art searches of methods of treating disease with an antisense oligonucleotide are not coextensive with prior art searches of methods of treating disease with an RNAi agent. Search of each of these inventions would require different key word searches of each compound and of each distinctive step of the method using divergent patent and non-patent literature databases. The different searches would then require subsequent in-depth analysis of the unrelated prior art literature, placing a serious burden on the Office in terms of both search and examination. As such, it would be burdensome to perform examination of inventions I and II together.

3. Claims 1 and 6 link(s) inventions I and II. The restriction requirement between the linked inventions is subject to the nonallowance of the linking claim(s), claims 1 and 6. Upon the allowance of the linking claim(s), the restriction requirement as to the linked inventions shall be withdrawn and any claim(s) depending from or otherwise including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) will be entitled to examination in the instant application. Applicant(s) are advised that if any such claim(s) depending from or including all the limitations of the allowable linking claim(s) is/are presented in a continuation or divisional application, the claims of the continuation or divisional application may be subject to provisional statutory and/or nonstatutory double patenting rejections over the claims of the instant application. Where a restriction

requirement is withdrawn, the provisions of 35 U.S.C. 121 are no longer applicable. *In re Ziegler*, 44 F.2d 1211, 1215, 170 USPQ 129, 131-32 (CCPA 1971). See also MPEP § 804.01.

***Restriction to a single nucleotide sequence***

Claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 are subject to an additional restriction since each is not considered to be a proper genus/Markush. See MPEP 803.02 - PRACTICE RE MARKUSH-TYPE CLAIMS - If the members of the Markush group are sufficiently few in number or so closely related that a search and examination of the entire claim can be made without serious burden, the examiner must examine all the members of the Markush group in the claim on the merits, even though they are directed to independent and distinct inventions. In such a case, the examiner will not follow the procedure described below and will not require restriction. Since the decisions in *In re Weber*, 580 F.2d 455, 198 USPQ 328 (CCPA 1978) and *In re Haas*, 580 F.2d 461, 198 USPQ 334 (CCPA 1978), it is improper for the Office to refuse to examine that which applicants regard as their invention, unless the subject matter in a claim lacks unity of invention. In *re Harnish*, 631 F.2d 716, 206 USPQ 300 (CCPA 1980); and *Ex parte Hozumi*, 3 USPQ2d 1059 (Bd. Pat. App. & Int. 1984). Broadly, unity of invention exists where compounds included within a Markush group (1) share a common utility, and (2) share a substantial structural feature disclosed as being essential to that utility.

Claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 specifically claim multiple SEQ ID NOS, which are either antisense oligonucleotides or RNAi agents targeted to clusterin. Although the

Art Unit: 1635

sequences claimed each target and modulate expression of clusterin, the instant sequences are considered to be unrelated, since each sequence claimed is structurally and functionally independent and distinct due to their unique nucleotide sequences. As such the Markush/genus of sequences in each of claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 is not considered to constitute a proper genus, and is therefore subject to restriction. Furthermore, a search of more than one (1) of the sequences claimed in claims 3, 5, 8 and 10 presents an undue burden on the Patent and Trademark Office due to the complex nature of the search in terms of computer time needed to perform the search and the subsequent analysis of the search results by the examiner. MPEP 808.02 states in part:

Where the related inventions as claimed are shown to be distinct under the criteria of MPEP 806.05(C) - 806.05(i), the examiner, in order to establish reasons for insisting upon restriction, must show by appropriate explanation one of the following:

(C) A different field of search: Where it is necessary to search for one of the distinct subjects in places where no pertinent art to the other subject exists, a different field of search is shown, even though the two are classified together.

It is noted that a search of the available sequence databases produces a listing of references disclosing the sequence most similar to the query sequence. This is the "place" where the examiner searches for prior art. The prior art relating to another query sequence will not be found in this "place" - a different listing of references must be generated and searched by the examiner. Thus a different search is shown, and restriction is proper. In view of the foregoing, one (1) sequence is considered to be a reasonable number of sequences for examination.

Accordingly, if invention I is elected, applicants are required to elect one sequence from those that appear in claims 3 and 8.

If invention II is elected, applicants are required to elect one sequence from those that appear in claims 5 and 10. A search of a sequence that is an RNAi agent will automatically search the complement of this sequence.

Note that this is not a species election.

Applicant is advised that the reply to this requirement to be complete must include an election of the invention to be examined even though the requirement be traversed (37 CFR 1.143).

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Tracy Vivlemore whose telephone number is 571-272-2914. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Fri 8:45-5:15.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's acting supervisor, Andrew Wang can be reached on 571-272-0811. The central FAX Number is 571-273-8300.

Patent applicants with problems or questions regarding electronic images that can be viewed in the Patent Application Information Retrieval system (PAIR) can now

Art Unit: 1635

contact the USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center (Patent EBC) for assistance.

Representatives are available to answer your questions daily from 6 am to midnight

(EST). The toll free number is (866) 217-9197. When calling please have your

application serial or patent number, the type of document you are having an image

problem with, the number of pages and the specific nature of the problem. The Patent

Electronic Business Center will notify applicants of the resolution of the problem within

5-7 business days. Applicants can also check PAIR to confirm that the problem has

been corrected. The USPTO's Patent Electronic Business Center is a complete service

center supporting all patent business on the Internet. The USPTO's PAIR system

provides Internet-based access to patent application status and history information. It

also enables applicants to view the scanned images of their own application file


folder(s) as well as general patent information available to the public. For more

information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>.

For all other customer support, please call the USPTO Call Center (UCC) at 800-786-9199.

Tracy Vivlemore  
Examiner  
Art Unit 1635

TV  
October 4, 2005

  
**J.D. SCHULTZ, Ph.D.**  
**PATENT EXAMINER**